

Appendix E
Attachment 1

Comment Summaries and Responses

APPENDIX E, ATTACHMENT 1

Summary of Written Comments on the Draft SD1 and DWR Responses

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
F-01-01	National Park Service, California Hydro Program November 16, 2001	NPS supports DWR's decision to pursue the Alternative License Process. In addition, the communications protocol has been well implemented.	Comment noted.
F-01-02	National Park Service, California Hydro Program November 16, 2001	The installation of Obermeyer gates on the emergency spillway ogee crest has the potential of affecting the nationally-designated Feather Wild and Scenic River (MiddleFork). If this alternative is recommended, the NPS would expect a study be conducted.	As required by both NEPA and CEQA, DWR would assess impacts associated with alternatives that DWR is considering for implementation.
F-01-03	National Park Service, California Hydro Program November 16, 2001	NPS is comfortable with "Issue Statements" for Recreations and Socioeconomics. But they renew their concern about DWR's self-imposed obligation to tie them back to the "Resource Issues, Concerns and Comments" which were recorded in the initial public meeting and subsequent brainstorming sessions.	DWR has used the issues statements for recreation to develop studies that address stakeholder concerns and issues. DWR has developed the issue tracker in Appendix B to allow stakeholders to follow an issue through the ALP.
F-01-04	National Park Service, California Hydro Program November 16, 2001	Recreation resource issues are being adequately examined in the seventeen recreation study plans, which have been proposed.	Comment noted.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
F-01-05	National Park Service, California Hydro Program November 16, 2001	NPS is perplexed regarding Issue S2 and how providing lower utility rates to the Oroville area applies to this relicensing proceeding given the contractual constraints of SWP.	DWR has investigated this issue in conjunction with Butte County Tax Payers Association, and determined that it is not practical due to feasibility, cost, and regulatory constraints.
F-01-06	National Park Service, California Hydro Program November 16, 2001	An analysis of the recreation and socio-economic effects of several upstream-projects are particularly important in this proceeding.	Study Plan SP-R5 will include an analysis of regional recreation supply and demand. The relicensing recreation studies for the upstream projects are included in Attachment A (the existing information) of this study. The relicensing collaborative may also consider issues associated with these facilities in their analysis of cumulative impacts.
F-01-07	National Park Service, California Hydro Program November 16, 2001	NPS feels that the consultants are doing an excellent job of producing study plans, keeping the Recreation & Socio-economic Work Group informed and responding effectively to their concerns.	Comment noted.
F-02-01	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	Desire to ensure that the operation and maintenance of Oroville Facilities are consistent with the National Forest Management Act and the Plumas National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-L3.
F-02-02	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	Forest Service expects the proposed studies will help identify and focus on appropriate stipulations from Section 4(e) of the Federal Power Act.	DWR and the Forest Service have continued to coordinate through the working groups on the development and implementation of study plans that would address potential 4(e) conditions.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
F-02-03	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	Some of the Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines submitted to DWR on January 29, 2001 were modified or replaced and incorporated into the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment. While these changes have not been sent to you, it is unlikely that the updated Standards and Guidelines would result in alterations to Issue Statements appearing in the Draft SD1.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-L3.
F-02-04	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	A listing of items the Forest Service wishes to have addressed during relicensing was submitted on Mar. 2, 2001. The Forest Service has participated in the formulation of Issue Statements and Study Plans.	These issues have been considered in the development of study plans and are tracked in Appendix B of the Final SD1.
F-02-05	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	Issue Statements from Draft SD1 considered most important to decision-making: 4.3 Water Quantity and Quality (W) W3, W5, and W7.	These issue statements are addressed in Study Plans SP-W1 through SP-W9.
F-02-06	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	Issue Statements from Draft SD1 considered most important to decision-making: 4.4 Fisheries Resources (F) F1, F4, F7, F8, and F13.	These issue statements are addressed in Study Plans SP-F3.1, SP-F8, and SP-F10.
F-02-07	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	Issue Statements from Draft SD1 considered most important to decision-making: 4.5 Terrestrial Resources (T) T1 through T11.	These issue statements are addressed in Study Plans SP-T1 through SP-T11.
F-02-08	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	Issue Statements from Draft SD1 considered most important to decision-making: 4.7 Cultural Resources (C) CR1 through CR4.	These issue statements are addressed in Study Plans SP-C1 through SP-C4.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
F-02-09	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	Issue Statements from Draft SD1 considered most important to decision-making: 4.9 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetic Resources (LU/LM/A) LU1 and LU2.	These issue statements are addressed in Study Plans SP-L1 and SP-L2.
F-02-10	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	Forest Service needs evaluation similar to that described in issue statements F13 and T2 for agency identified Sensitive Species for portions of the project located on or affecting National Forest System lands.	These issue statements are addressed in Study Plan SP-T2.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
F-02-11	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	The relationship of the project to the Middle Fork Feather Wild and Scenic River needs to be studied. Does operation and maintenance of the project encroach on the area or unreasonably diminishes the scenic, recreational, and fish and wildlife values present in the area on the date of designation of the Middle Fork of the Feather River (October 2, 1968)?	<p>The Middle Fork Feather River above Lake Oroville was designated as Wild and Scenic in 1968. Current operations and maintenance practices do not encroach on the designated Wild and Scenic Reach of the river.</p> <p>Motorized boat access and encroachment on the Wild and Scenic Reach is currently precluded by a set of Class V rapids. However, structural changes to the main dam could raise reservoir levels, allowing motorized boat traffic into the Wild and Scenic Reach.</p> <p>Operational scenarios that would increase water levels are being evaluated by various flood protection studies independent of the relicensing process and any proposed changes that may result from those studies would have to undergo their own environmental documentation. It is anticipated that any operational changes related to flood protection that increase pool elevations would be infrequent and of short durations.</p> <p>DWR will continue to confer with the FS on alternative operations and implementation of PME measures that could affect the Middle Fork Feather Wild and Scenic River values.</p>

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
F-02-12	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	Request that the proposed action or one alternative include any mandatory conditions required by the Forest Service.	NEPA evaluation of FS 4(e) conditions requires that these conditions be determined during the development of alternatives. To comply with CEQA and NEPA, DWR is currently developing alternatives to the proposed action/proposed project. SD2 will include a description of alternatives that will be considered in the PDEA.
F-02-13	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	Scope of the studies should include the areas affected by the project, and not be limited by the project boundary. Results from studies can help refine analysis for draft EA.	The scope of study plans has been addressed for each study in the Work Group and Plenary Study Plan review process.
F-02-14	Plumas National Forest November 14, 2001	It is difficult at this stage in the project to identify issues that require less detailed analysis.	The level of effort for each study has been reviewed by the Work Groups and the Plenary Group.
F-03-01	National Marine Fisheries Service October 11, 2001	To determine a species needs, NMFS often looks to historical unimpaired flow conditions as a guide/reference for gauging the effects of a project on a species' ability to survive in the current ecosystem.	Study Plan SP-F10 will not address conditions before the dam was built; however recent trends in fisheries will be considered based on available data sources.
F-03-02	National Marine Fisheries Service October 11, 2001	The extent of the action area for the Oroville Project may change as new information, particularly on cumulative impacts, is generated through the relicensing process.	Section 5.1 of the Final SD1 provides the DWR approach for analysis of cumulative impacts.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
F-03-03	National Marine Fisheries Service October 11, 2001	When FERC considers whether to re-license a hydropower project, it must review the project to ensure it is best adapted to a comprehensive plan for protection, mitigation and enhancement of fish and wildlife.	Comment noted.
F-03-04	National Marine Fisheries Service October 11, 2001	DWR must meet CEQ regulations to consider in a single EIS, "Indirect Effects," Cumulative Impacts," and "Connected Actions."	FERC will consider compliance with NEPA when issuing a new license for the project, including connected actions, indirect effects, and cumulative impacts. DWRs PDEA will assess the potential for project-related effects under a new license. DWR intends to comply with CEQ regulations.
F-03-05	National Marine Fisheries Service October 11, 2001	FERC should prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the federal action of relicensing the project.	FERC will determine whether an EIS or EA is appropriate for the relicensing project.
F-03-06	National Marine Fisheries Service October 11, 2001	All studies must be sufficient to fully describe impacts of the proposed hydroelectric project license and alternatives. Studies must include direct, indirect and cumulative impacts, extending downstream to the confluence with the ocean unless specific threshold analyses indicate otherwise.	The scope of studies has been considered in consultation with the NMFS during the Task Force, Work Group, and Plenary Group meetings for the study plans. A list of final study plans has been included in Appendix D.
F-03-07	National Marine Fisheries Service October 11, 2001	The licensee must conduct adequate studies to fully develop a range of alternatives for providing fish passage including plans for restoring access to historic habitats.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan F-15.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
F-03-08	National Marine Fisheries Service October 11, 2001	As stated by FERC, environment affected is clearly not only within project boundaries. Mitigation for impacts on fish and wildlife must consider the project area and its vicinity.	The ALP has developed the scope and approach for each study plan.
G-01-01	California Business Properties Association No date	It is important that we maintain the water supplies that we currently have.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-01-02	California Business Properties Association No date	The CalFed solution recognizes the need for more water storage. Preventing the loss of water storage should be considered in the Oroville proceedings.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-01-03	California Business Properties Association No date	Relicensing process should not duplicate efforts of CalFed solution area, which encompasses the Feather River watershed.	Please see DWR's approach for CALFED coordination in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
G-01-04	California Business Properties Association No date	This process must weigh its actions in light of their potential negative impacts on a high-quality water supply from Oroville to other areas of California.	DWR has developed eight study plans to address water quality impacts associated with the proposed project. Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-01-05	California Business Properties Association No date	California cannot afford to lose any more water due to regulatory fiat.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
G-02-01	California Chamber of Commerce October 29, 2001	Existing generation provided by Hyatt and Thermalito should be preserved.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-02-02	California Chamber of Commerce October 29, 2001	Allowing the Project to maintain electrical output will help keep the cost of water down.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-03-01	Association of California Water Agencies October 30, 2001	Significant impacts on California due to loss of water supply should be investigated in the relicensing of the Oroville Facilities.	See Sections 4.0 and 5.0 of the PPEA. Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-03-02	Association of California Water Agencies October 30, 2001	Project should retain the important water and power benefits the Facilities provide to the State.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-04-01	California ISO November 26, 2001	ISO controlled grid has ties to the hydroelectric pump-generators at Hyatt-Thermalito. Difficulties presently exist within the ISO controlled grid. The Complex helps the ISO manage these problems.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-04-02	California ISO November 26, 2001	The pump generation facilities at Oroville are important for generating capacity and reliability benefits to the ISO grid. (frequency regulation, voltage support, operating resource capacity, and supplemental energy)	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
G-05-01	Oroville Foundation of Flight October 29, 2001	Request for a year-round Seaplane base at the Afterbay waterway.	This proposal was considered as a potential interim project. However, additional information is needed to assess project feasibility.
G-06-01	Southern California Water Committee October 30, 2001	Southern California has already lost significant high quality water supplies in other regulatory processes. We cannot afford to further reduce supplemental water necessary to support Southern California's economy.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-06-02	Southern California Water Committee October 30, 2001	The relicensing process should maintain benefits currently received from the water stored at reservoir and continue to use Project-generated power to offset the water cost.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-07-01	Southern California Water Committee October 30, 2001	Southern California has already lost significant high quality water supplies in other regulatory processes. We cannot afford to further reduce supplemental water necessary to support Southern California's economy and population.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-07-02	Southern California Water Committee October 30, 2001	The relicensing process should maintain benefits currently received from the water stored at reservoir and continue to use Project-generated power to offset the water cost.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
G-08-01	Paleo Resource Consultants, F&F Geo Resource Associates, Inc November 26, 2001	Oroville Facilities relicensing environmental assessment should include: determine the nature, distribution, and value of paleontological resources within the Area of Potential Effects.	Data from Study Plans SP-G1 and SP-G2 will be used to address this issue.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
G-08-02	Paleo Resource Consultants, F&F Geo Resource Associates, Inc November 26, 2001	Oroville Facilities relicensing environmental assessment should include: evaluate the need and methods to provide protection of paleontological resources within the APE.	Data from Study Plans SP-G1 and SP-G2 will be used to address this issue.
G-08-03	Paleo Resource Consultants, F&F Geo Resource Associates, Inc November 26, 2001	Oroville Facilities relicensing environmental assessment should include: determine the effects of existing and future project facilities, operations, and maintenance on paleontological resources within the APE.	Data from Study Plans SP-G1 and SP-G2 will be used to address this issue.
G-08-04	Paleo Resource Consultants, F&F Geo Resource Associates, Inc November 26, 2001	Oroville Facilities relicensing environmental assessment should include: provide for the interpretation of paleontological resources and make available paleontological resources data relative to the Oroville project area.	Data from Study Plans SP-G1 and SP-G2 will be used to address this issue.
G-08-05	Paleo Resource Consultants, F&F Geo Resource Associates, Inc November 26, 2001	Additional paleontological resource issues may need to be addressed once an initial survey of paleontological resources within the APE has been completed.	Data from Study Plans SP-G1 and SP-G2 will be used to address this issue.
G-09-01	Civil Engineering Services November 16, 2001	Concern involves the volume of traffic, which the Lake Oroville facilities generate and the routes by which users have access. A map of four routes and descriptions were included.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-R14.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
G-09-02	Civil Engineering Services November 16, 2001	Request that DWR study the aspect of access to the Project and coordinate with Caltrans and Butte County Public Works Departments to make best utilization of available routs for maximum reduction of impact on Highway 162.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-R14.
G-09-03	Civil Engineering Services November 16, 2001	The relicensing effort should include thorough signing on all alternate routes and an organized effort to inform and encourage the visitors with their options for access.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-R14.
S-01-01	State of California Electricity Oversight Board October 30, 2001	Underscores important electric contribution of the Facilities including ancillary services to maintain overall grid reliability.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
S-02-01	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	A NEPA/CEQA environmental document that adequately addresses the needs of the SWRCB is necessary to support any Section 401 Certification issued.	DWR has been coordinating with the SWRCB in the Working Groups to address resource concerns related to the Oroville Facilities. DWR will be coordinating with SWRCB on other CEQA/NEPA concerns that should be considered with an application for 401 Certification.
S-02-02	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	SWRCB staff recommends that all issues in Appendix B of Draft SD1 be addressed if the ALP collaborative team is to effectively analyze the effects of current project operation on attributes of the Feather River system and locale.	Appendix B of the Final SD1 has been reformatted in a manner that allows stakeholders and agency staff to track issues through the ALP.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-02-03	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	The language in Draft SD1 is vague as to the approach that will be taken by DWR to meet Lead Agency requirements under CEQA. SD2 should clearly disclose how CEQA compliance will be met.	DWR will be coordinating with the SWRCB and FERC on the environmental review of the proposed project in compliance with CEQA and NEPA.
S-02-04	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	The collaborative team must remain aware that familiarity with the project and its effects on resources may generate additional resource concerns that need to be addressed later in this process.	The ALP has developed the scope and approach for each study plan.
S-02-05	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	The APEA and CEQA documents must provide data to support a conclusion that project features and operation are protective of the beneficial uses designated for project-affected waters.	The ALP has developed several study plans in consultation with the SWRCB to address collection of adequate data for evaluation of beneficial uses of the project waters. Study Plan SP-W1 will focus on this issue.
S-02-06	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	SD2 should fully disclose the Interim Measures philosophy, a list of recreation issues addressed, and the process that will be followed to select and incorporate them into NEPA and CEQA environmental filing package(s).	The Recreation Work Group developed a list of interim projects. These were addressed by the Plenary Group and forwarded to DWR for consideration. Please see interim project discussion for more detail in Section 3.2 of Appendix E.
S-02-07	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Adequate data must be collected to support the SWRCB's evaluation of project effects on the designated beneficial uses of Lake Oroville and Feather River waters.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-W1.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-02-08	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Water temperature studies should be designed to include a minimum of three years of thermographic data collection in attempt to provide representation of various water year types. Analysis should also include the potential management of cold- water releases from the dam's existing low-level outlet.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-W6.
S-02-09	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	A feasibility study should be conducted to determine potential whitewater uses that could be achieved by utilizing natural or controlled flows upstream and downstream of the project features.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-R16.
S-02-10	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Information is needed to determine whether any of the proposed interim projects are actually outstanding responsibilities under the existing license.	DWR is in compliance with all license articles related to recreation. Please see discussion of interim projects and license conditions for more detail in Section 3.2 of Appendix E.
S-02-11	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Inventories of OWA sensitive plant, amphibian, and avian species should be conducted and risk factors to individuals and populations determined for future management decisions.	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-T2 and SP-T4.
S-02-12	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	DWR should consider the benefits and trade-offs that would occur with the re-operation of the water delivery system through the Thermalito Afterbay. This would allow for the separate delivery of water for agricultural diversions and fisheries releases.	Study Plans SP-E7and SP-E8 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The specific scenarios suggested by SWRCB will be considered as part of a suite of analyses performed in the study plans.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-02-13	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Studies should address all parameters of water quality as flow enters the project boundaries, passes through facility features, and discharges downstream.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-W1.
S-02-14	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	The primary purpose of the Oroville project is to provide a supply of water for various municipalities and for irrigation, power generation is recognized as incidental use of project waters. The licensee must demonstrate that primary water uses can be satisfied in season and in magnitude prior to scheduling delivery of stored water for power generation.	As part of the SWP, Lake Oroville is used to impound water for water supply. Power production is a by-product of the water supply and regulatory operations.
S-02-15a	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	What are the potential impacts of fluctuation zone and surface elevation change on recreation opportunities?	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP- E2 and SP-R3.
S-02-15b	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	What are the potential impacts of fluctuation zone and surface elevation change on fish habitat?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F3.1.
S-02-15c	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	What are the potential impacts of fluctuation zone and surface elevation change on wildlife habitat?	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-T1 and SP-T3/5

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-02-16	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Proximity of project features and recreational facilities to shoreline and banks of water bodies offers potential for introduction of nutrients and bacterial contaminants to these waters. What are the water quality trends (including, but not limited to nitrogen, phosphorous and coliform bacteria levels) associated with project related activities?	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-W3 and SP-W7.
S-02-17	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Lake Oroville, fed by tributaries that have a history of gold mining activity, has potential for accumulation of elemental mercury in it's basin sediments. Potential presence and uptake of methylmercury through the food chain must be assessed.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-W2.
S-02-18	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Both cold water and warm water habitat, spawning, and migration uses have been designated for surface waters potentially affected by the project. A determination must be made as to specific thermal habitat that may be reasonably provided in each water body within project boundaries and downstream of the project.	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-F3.1 and SP-F3.2. Study Plans SP-E1.3, SP-E1.5, SP-E6, SP-E7, and SP-E8 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.
S-02-19	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Depth and capacity of the Oroville reservoir creates a thermally stratified condition. What is the cold-water pool retained in the basin and what is its availability for release in various water year types?	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-W1 and SP-W6. Study Plans SP-E1.3 and SP-E7 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-02-20	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Thermalito Afterbay acts as a thermal retention basin for project water prior to delivery to water districts outside the project boundary. How do releases from Thermalito Afterbay affect the stream temperature and dissolved oxygen content of Feather River receiving waters?	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-W1 and SP-W6.
S-02-21	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	The Feather River's low-flow reach has historically provided spawning habitat for cold water fishery. How have reduced flows to the Feather River's low-flow reach affected water temperature and gravel substrate necessary for successful salmonid reproduction?	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-F10, and SP-G2.
S-02-22	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Project features and operations alter the hydrology of the system, creating the possibility for scour zones within both natural and designed channels. What affects do discharge and ramping rates have on substrate scour and the mobilization of sediments into the water column downstream? How have turbidity levels been affected by project operation?	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-G2 and SP-W1.
S-02-23	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Alterations in stream hydrology affect the natural fluvial geomorphologic processes of a riverine system. How has the change in magnitude, frequency and timing of peak flows on the Feather River affected riparian vegetation recruitment in the low-flow reach and immediately downstream of Afterbay?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-T3/5.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-02-24	State Water Resources Control Board November 21, 2001	Various recreational and public use facilities were designated as mitigation measures to minimize impacts resulting from the original Oroville project construction. The licensee should provide a complete inventory of recreational mitigation obligations required by Articles of the existing FERC license, and should clearly disclose the current status of compliance with those measures.	DWR is in compliance with the existing license. Please see the discussion on existing license conditions in Section 3.1 of Appendix E.
S-03-01	California Department of Fish & Game November 21, 2001	One Department of Fish and Game relicensing issue that appears to have been lost is the concern for funding of the OWA.	This issue is included in issue statement LM1 in this document. This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-T6, SP-R4, and SP-L2.
S-03-02	California Department of Fish & Game November 21, 2001	Department of Fish and Game requests that the Oroville Facilities ALP address the need for additional funding for operation of the OWA.	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-T6, SP-R4, and SP-L2.
S-03-03	California Department of Fish & Game November 21, 2001	(Pg v & Pg 1-Draft SD1) The Final Scoping Document should define the term "facility" refers to just the hydropower operation or the entire Complex.	"Oroville Facilities" is defined in the footnote of the executive summary and introduction of the Draft and Final SD1.
S-03-04	California Department of Fish & Game November 21, 2001	(Pg 3-Draft SD1) Highway 99 between Yuba City and Chico is labeled Highway 70.	Figure 1 has been revised.
S-03-05	California Department of Fish & Game November 21, 2001	(Pg 5-Draft SD1)The ALP process offers the public more that three formal comment opportunities which will also occur after the SD2 is published and during the SWRCB 401 certification process.	The ALP offers three formal opportunities for the public to provide comments to DWR. The 401 certification process is outside the ALP.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-03-06	California Department of Fish & Game November 21, 2001	(Pg 20-Draft SD1) DWR should not eliminate "project retirement or issuance of a non-power license" from range of alternatives. FERC "Guidelines for Preparing Environmental Assessments" provides detailed information on evaluating project retirement as a licensing alternative.	To comply with CEQA and NEPA, DWR is currently developing alternatives to the proposed action/proposed project. SD2 will include a description of alternatives that will be considered in the PDEA.
S-03-07	California Department of Fish & Game November 21, 2001	(Resource Issues-Appendix B-Draft SD1) DWR should also investigate fish screens and other facilities that provide downstream passage.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F15.
S-03-08	California Department of Fish & Game November 21, 2001	DWR should consider alternatives that would allow cooler waters from Lake Oroville to be directed to the low-flow channel while warmer waters are directed to the Thermalito Forebay.	The ALP will consider alternative methods for meeting temperature requirements with the completion of Study Plans SP-E6 and SP-E7.
S-03a-01	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are the project related Lake Oroville water level fluctuations presently affecting the reproduction and survival of warm-water sportfish?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F3.1.
S-03a-02	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Will project related Lake Oroville water fluctuations affect the reproduction and survival of warm-water sportfish under future operational demands?	Future operational demands are included in the model assumptions for Study Plan SP-E2. The reservoir stage data from the modeling process will include future water demand and will form the basis for analysis in Study Plan SP-F3.1, which addresses this issue.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-03a-03	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Is the present minimum pool adequate for protecting the Lake Oroville cold-water sport fishery.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F 3.1. Study Plan SP-E7 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.
S-03a-04a	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are the existing temperature requirements defined under SWP Feather River Flow Constraints, being met?	DWR has and continues to operate the Oroville Facilities to meet all applicable operational constraints. These include temperature objectives contained in the 1983 agreement between DWR and DFG as well as the objectives contained in the 2001 NMFS biological opinion for spring run Chinook and Steelhead.
S-03a-04b	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are steelhead adequately protected and fall, late-fall, and spring-run Chinook salmon in the low-flow section and in the river downstream of Thermalito Afterbay outlet?	This issue addressed in Study Plan SP-F10.
S-03a-05	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Is the availability of a cold-water pool in Lake Oroville adequate under present and future operational demands to meet the existing downstream present and future operational demands to cold freshwater habitat requirements of steelhead and fall, late-fall and spring-run Chinook salmon?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F3.1. Study Plan SP-E7 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.
S-03a-06	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are the existing temperature requirements defined under the SWP's Feather River Flow Constraints adequate for the operation of the Feather River Hatchery?	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-F9 and SP-W6.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-03a-07	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Is the availability of a cold-water pool in Lake Oroville adequate under present and future operational demands to meet SWP cold-water requirements for Feather River Flow Constraints for the Feather River Hatchery.	The hatchery uses a “chiller” if reservoir temperatures are not adequate. Therefore no additional study is warranted.
S-03a-08	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Does the existing Temperature Control Device in Lake Oroville provide adequate access to the cold water pool during below normal water or drier years?	Study Plan SP-E7 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.
S-03a-9	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Will the existing Temperature Control Device in Lake Oroville providing adequate access to the cold-water pool under future operational demands particularly during a series of dry and critically dry years?	Study Plan SP-E7 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.
S-03a-10	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Does the present temperature model have the ability to forecast average daily water temperatures, under present and future operational demands, in the low-flow channel and in the river from the Thermalito Afterbay outlet to Verona?	Study Plans SP-E2 and SP-E1.5 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.
S-03a-11	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	How does the Feather River Hatchery requirement for warm water in the summer impact river water temperatures required for holding or rearing of steelhead and spring-run Chinook salmon in the low-flow section?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F10. Study Plan SP-E1.2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-03a-12	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	How does the pump-back operation during the summer months affect water temperatures required for holding and rearing of steelhead and spring-run Chinook salmon in the low-flow section and river downstream of Thermalito Afterbay?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F10. Study Plans SP-E1.4 and SP-E8 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.
S-03a-13	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Do increases in river temperature from warmer Thermalito Afterbay releases during spring, summer & fall months limit suitable steelhead and salmon habitat downstream of Thermalito Afterbay?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F10. Study Plans SP-E1.5 and SP-E6 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.
S-03a-14	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Do increases in river temperature from warmer Thermalito Afterbay releases during spring, summer & fall months affect survival of salmonid species outmigrating from the Yuba River?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F10. Study Plan SP-E1.5 and SP-E6 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.
S-03a-15	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are Dissolved Oxygen levels in the Feather River from Thermalito Afterbay to Live Oak a problem during spring, summer and fall months?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-W1. Study Plan SP-E1.3 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.
S-03a-16	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are the present stream flows defined under SWP's Feather River Flow Constraints being met and adequately protecting steelhead and fall, late-fall, and spring-run Chinook salmon in the low-flow section and river downstream of Thermalito Afterbay?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F10.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-03a-17	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Is additional PHABSIM necessary to determine stream flows for spawning and rearing steelhead & fall, late-fall and spring-run Chinook salmon in the low-flow section and river downstream of Thermalito Afterbay?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F16.
S-03a-18	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Is riparian vegetative cover in the low-flow section and downstream of Thermalito Afterbay adequate under present flow conditions for rearing steelhead and fall, late-fall, and spring-run Chinook salmon?	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-F16 and SP-T3/5.
S-03a-19	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are the present flow requirements defined under SWP's Feather River Flow Constraints adequate for maintaining natural fluvial river functions in the low-flow section and downstream of Thermalito Afterbay?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-G2.
S-03a-20	California Department of Fish & Game, February 16, 2001	Under existing conditions, does the diversity and abundance of benthic macroinvertebrates in the low-flow section and downstream of Thermalito Afterbay suggest a healthy stream channel?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F1.
S-03a-21	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Under existing conditions, are there adequate amounts of suitable gravel for salmonid spawning in the low-flow section and downstream of Thermalito Afterbay?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F10.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-03a-22	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Under existing conditions, are bankful flows frequent enough to maintain channel morphology, sediment transport, habitat diversity and adequate gravels for salmonid spawning and rearing in the low-flow section and downstream of Thermalito Afterbay?	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-F10 and SP-G2.
S-03a-23	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Under existing conditions, are moderate winter floods and bankful flows adequately recruiting large woody debris needed to maintain adequate salmonid rearing habitat in the low-flow section and downstream of Thermalito Afterbay?	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-G1 and SP-G2.
S-03a-24	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	How will future demand for project water change timing and duration of moderate winter floods and bankful flows in the low-flow section and downstream of Thermalito Afterbay?	Study Plan SP-E1.1 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The modeling program CALSIM is being run with year 2020 demand.
S-03a-25	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are the present project ramping/fluctuation restraints adequately protecting rearing salmonid species from being stranded in the low-flow section and downstream of Thermalito Afterbay?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F16.
S-03a-26	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are the present project ramping/fluctuation restraints adequately protecting salmonid redds and spawning gravel from being scoured out from the low-flow section and downstream of Thermalito Afterbay?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F16.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-03a-27	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are engineering or other solutions available to prevent the interbreeding of fall and spring-run Chinook salmon in the low-flow section of the Feather River?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F9.
S-03a-28	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Would fish screens on the pump-back operation prevent Infectious Hemopatic Necrosis (IHN) and other diseases specific to salmonid species from spreading and becoming permanently established in Lake Oroville?	The fish disease issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-F2.
S-03a-29	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are additional funds needed to augment the existing budget at the OWA? Presently available Fish and Game funds are being dedicated to managing people and not wildlife habitat.	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-L2, SP-R4, and SP-T6.
S-03a-30	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Are additional funds needed for law enforcement at the OWA? Additional funding for more wardens would free up time for other law enforcement activities outside of the OWA.	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-L2, SP-R2, and SP-T6.
S-03a-31	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Have surveys been completed to determine what State of federally listed species (plant & animal) are potentially being impacted by project operations?	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-T2.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
S-03a-32	California Department of Fish & Game February 16, 2001	Has DWR completed or met its obligations for recreation mitigation (wildlife habitat & fishing) under the existing FERC license?	DWR is in compliance with the FERC license conditions. Please see DWR discussion of the existing license conditions in Section 3.1 of Appendix E.
S-03b-01	California Department of Fish & Game July 2, 2001	Department of Fish and Game submitted OWA budgetary needs at the February 28, 2001 Plenary Meeting with a request for review by the Recreation and Socioeconomic Work Group's Task Force.	This issue is included in issue statement LM1 of Section 4.0 of this document. This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-T6, SP-R4, and SP-L2. The interim project "Wildlife Technical and Warden Funding" was grouped by the Task Force as a potential phase II interim project. These phase II projects will benefit from information collected during relicensing studies.
S-03b-02	California Department of Fish & Game July 2, 2001	The operation and maintenance of the OWA has been a concern at all the work groups, especially the Environmental and Recreational groups. The biggest concerns include public safety, wildlife habitat, cleanliness, and if Fish & Game is fulfilling the mitigation and/or mandates of the original license.	The wildlife habitat issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-T1. Operation of the OWA is addressed in Study Plans SP-T6 and SP-T9. The recreational use of the OWA is addressed in Study Plans SP-R4, SP-R5, and SP-R11. Please see DWR discussion of the existing license conditions in Section 3.1 of Appendix E.
S-03b-03	California Department of Fish & Game July 2, 2001	Department of Fish and Game requests additional funding for the OWA.	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-T6, SP-R4, and SP-L2.
W-01-01	State Water Contractors October 30, 2001	Retaining or enhancing the current water supply and power generation from the Oroville Facility is essential for maintaining a reliable and affordable water supply for California.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-01-02	State Water Contractors October 30, 2001	Operational changes that reduce the power generation capability and flexibility will result in increased water costs.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-01-03	State Water Contractors October 30, 2001	Loss of generation at Oroville will require SWP to purchase replacement energy thus increasing cost of water and imposes additional demand on scarce electric energy supply.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-01-04	State Water Contractors October 30, 2001	Concerned that operational changes will diminish the water supply available to SWP. California is on the verge of a water supply crisis that may well dwarf California's current energy crisis.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-01-05	State Water Contractors October 30, 2001	Relicensing the project should not duplicate efforts on environmental and flood management issues nor of the CalFed, Central Valley Project Improvement Act and other ecosystem restoration initiatives.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-01-06	State Water Contractors October 30, 2001	The environmental and flood management studies need to be tightly and strictly focused within the project boundary.	The scope of study plans has been addressed for each study in the Work Group and Plenary study plan review process.
W-01-07	State Water Contractors October 30, 2001	Any options considered in relicensing the project must be complementary to the CALFED program and the Sacramento and San Joaquin Basins comprehensive Study.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-01-08	State Water Contractors October 30, 2001	Any options considered in relicensing the project should not result in additional losses of SWP water supplies.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-01-9	State Water Contractors October 30, 2001	Maintaining or increasing the flexibility in releases is required to continue the beneficial use of the project for providing reliable operation of the SWP and the power grid.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-02-01	Kern County Water Agency October 30, 2001	Retaining or enhancing the current water and power generation from the Oroville Facilities is essential for maintaining a reliable and affordable water supply for California.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-02-02	Kern County Water Agency October 30, 2001	Operational changes that reduce the power generation capability and flexibility will result in increased water costs to the Agency.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-02-03	Kern County Water Agency October 30, 2001	Concerned that operational changes will limit the water supply available.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-02-04	Kern County Water Agency October 30, 2001	Relicensing the project should not duplicate efforts of CalFed, Central Valley Project Improvement Act, and other ecosystem restoration initiatives.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-02-05	Kern County Water Agency October 30, 2001	The environmental studies need to be tightly and strictly focused within the project boundary.	The scope of study plans has been addressed for each study in the Work Group and Plenary study plan review process.
W-02-06	Kern County Water Agency October 30, 2001	Environmental studies considered in the Project relicensing must be complementary to the CALFED program and not result in losses to SWP water supplies.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-02-07	Kern County Water Agency October 30, 2001	Maintaining or increasing the flexibility in releases is required to continue the beneficial use of the project for providing reliable operation of the power grid.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-03-01	Alameda County Flood Control & Water Conservation District October 30, 2001	Retaining or enhancing the current water and power generation from the Oroville Facilities is essential for maintaining a reliable and affordable water supply for California.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-03-02	Alameda County Flood Control & Water Conservation District October 30, 2001	Concerned with operational changes that might result in reducing the power generation capability and flexibility.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-03-03	Alameda County Flood Control & Water Conservation District October 30, 2001	Concerned with the operational changes that will erode water supply available to the SWP.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-03-04	Alameda County Flood Control & Water Conservation District October 30, 2001	Relicensing the project should not duplicate efforts of CalFed, and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act and other ecosystem restoration initiatives.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-03-05	Alameda County Flood Control & Water Conservation District October 30, 2001	The environmental studies need to be tightly and strictly focused within the project boundary.	The scope of study plans has been addressed for each study in the Work Group and Plenary study plan review process.
W-03-06	Alameda County Flood Control & Water Conservation District October 30, 2001	Environmental studies considered in relicensing the Project must be complementary to the CALFED program and not result in losses to SWP water supplies.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-03-07	Alameda County Flood Control & Water Conservation District October 30, 2001	Maintaining or increasing the flexibility in releases is required to continue the beneficial use of the project for providing reliable operation of the power grid.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-03-08	Alameda County Flood Control & Water Conservation District October 30, 2001	The relicensing process should seek innovative and creative solutions to meet the environmental, recreational and flood management needs in balance with maintaining power resources and water supply.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible. The ALP provides a forum for review of the issues and concerns throughout the relicensing process. This is the forum to discuss a balance of resource benefits.
W-04-01	Castaic Lake Water Agency October 30, 2001	Retaining or enhancing the current water and power generation from the Oroville Facilities is essential for maintaining a reliable and affordable water supply for California.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-04-02	Castaic Lake Water Agency October 30, 2001	Operational changes that reduce the power generation will result in increased costs to SWP contractors.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-04-03	Castaic Lake Water Agency October 30, 2001	Concerned that operational changes will limit the water supply available.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-04-04	Castaic Lake Water Agency October 30, 2001	Relicensing the project should not duplicate efforts of CalFed, Central Valley Project Improvement Act and other ecosystem restoration initiatives.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-04-05	Castaic Lake Water Agency October 30, 2001	The environmental studies need to be tightly and strictly focused within the project boundary.	The scope of study plans has been addressed for each study in the Work Group and Plenary study plan review process.
W-04-06	Castaic Lake Water Agency October 30, 2001	Environmental studies should be complementary to CALFED and not result in losses of SWP water supplies.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of this appendix.
W-04-07	Castaic Lake Water Agency October 30, 2001	Maintaining or increasing the flexibility in releases is required to continue the beneficial use of the project for providing reliable operation of the power grid.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-04-08	Castaic Lake Water Agency October 30, 2001	The relicensing process should seek innovative and creative solutions to meet the environmental, recreational and flood management needs in balance with maintaining power resources and water supply.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible. The ALP provides a forum for review of the issues and concerns throughout the relicensing process. This is the forum to discuss a balance of resource benefits.
W-05-01	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California November 26, 2001	Oroville Facilities' importance to California's water and power supply can't be overstated. DWR should act as a good steward and safeguard those benefits.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-05-02	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California November 26, 2001	Preservation of flood control, recreation and fish and wildlife objectives provided by the Facilities are also important.	The ALP has developed studies to address flood control (SP-E4), recreation (SP- R1 thru R19), fish and wildlife (SP-F1 through SP-F21 and SP-T1 through SP-T11).
W-05-03	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California November 26, 2001	There should be balanced decision-making regarding the resources and objectives and without compromising their associated existing benefits.	The ALP provides a forum for review of the issues and concerns throughout the relicensing process. This is the forum to discuss a balance of resource benefits.
W-05-04	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California November 26, 2001	The SWP is primarily operated to produce energy for the grid during on peak hours and to consume energy during off peak hours. This method of operation has provided enormous benefits to CA energy consumers during the recent energy crisis by keeping peak energy consumption down and the lights in homes, factories and businesses on.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-05-05	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California November 26, 2001	It is critical the FERC relicensing respect the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, which for nearly seven years has been developing a comprehensive program now in implementation-for managing the entire Bay-Delta watershed for environmental and economic purposes.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-05-06	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California November 26, 2001	MWD strongly believes that it would be highly inappropriate for the relicensing process to second-guess the measures and level of protection for the environment developed through the extensive public process of CALFED's developed, far-reaching plan for environmental protection and restoration in the Bay-Delta watershed.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-05-07	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California November 26, 2001	The CALFED process has strongly emphasized development of local resources and other innovative management approaches to meet growing demands for water in California. Nowhere has this mandate been more fully implemented than in Southern California.	Comment noted.
W-05-08	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California November 26, 2001	While the reliability of existing SWP supplies is critical for the regional economy, additional supplies from Oroville are not part of MWD plans to meet Southern California's future water supply needs.	Comment noted.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-06-01	Santa Clara Valley Water District November 26, 2001	Reliability of District's water supply should be maintained or enhanced. SWP water is important for meeting the District's objectives for water source availability, water quantity, and water quality.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-06-02	Santa Clara Valley Water District November 26, 2001	Concern for power supply from Oroville Facilities needed to supply SWP water and the negative economic effects a reduced power supply could have.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-06-03	Santa Clara Valley Water District November 26, 2001	Concerned that all of the District's comments on the Plenary review of Draft NEPA SD1 and CEQA Notice of Preparation were not included in the Draft SD1 and Notice of Preparation. Request that DWR address earlier comments.	DWR has reviewed all of the comments received on the administrative review of the Draft SD1 and addressed those issues where possible in the revision of the document. The Draft SD1 was released after Plenary Group review and consensus. Some issues require modification to the ALP and could not be addressed in the Final SD1.
W-06-04	Santa Clara Valley Water District November 26, 2001	The District agrees with and incorporates the SWC comments (to their letter) on the September 27, 2001 draft NEPA SD1 and CEQA Notice of Preparation.	DWR has reviewed the SWC comments received on the Draft SD1 and provided responses to those comments in this appendix and the revised text of the Final SD1. Some issues require modification to the ALP and could not be addressed in the Final SD1.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-07-01	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Not all SWC comments from the Plenary review of Draft SD1 were incorporated in September 27, 2001 revision of the Draft SD1. Please reconsider comments.	DWR has reviewed all of the comments received on the administrative review of the Draft SD1 and addressed those issues where possible in the revision of the document. The Draft SD1 was released after Plenary Group review and consensus. Some issues require modification to the ALP and could not be addressed in the Final SD1.
W-07-02	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Concerned that DWR did not include its relicensing objectives and goals for each resource area in the Sept. 27 revision the Draft SD1.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
W-07-03	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Suggests that two documents that provide criteria for evaluating the need for proposed studies be included in an appendix of the Final SD1. Further suggests that DWR review the evaluation criteria with the Plenary Group and include criteria in the Final SD1.	The merits of each study plan have been considered in the ALP, within the Work Group and Plenary Group. DWR is now in the process of implementing the study plans.
W-07-04	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Suggests amending language in Section 3.1.3, p. 20 to clarify what is implicit therein so that it accords with NEPA practice. Revised language is proposed. Further, the SWC also agrees with the discussion in Section 3.2, that alternatives of project retirement or issuance of a non-power license can be eliminated from further consideration.	To comply with CEQA and NEPA, DWR is currently developing alternatives to the proposed action/proposed project. SD2 will include a description of alternatives that will be considered in the PDEA.
W-07-05	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Section 5.1 of the Draft SD1 should provide more guidance on the proper scope of the cumulative effects analysis.	An approach has been developed for the evaluation of cumulative impacts. Please consult section 5.1 of the Final SD1.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-07-06	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Determining the geographic scope of the cumulative effect analysis should be done only after cumulative effects pathways and cause-effect relationships have been analyzed and specific cumulative effects issues identified.	An approach has been developed for the evaluation of cumulative impacts. Please consult section 5.1 of the Final SD1.
W-07-07	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Concern that practical limits must be established regarding the geographic area in which cumulative impacts of the proposed action are likely to occur.	Comment noted.
W-07-08	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Studies by other agencies and from other proceedings should be utilized in analyzing cumulative effects instead of conducting new studies.	Comment noted.
W-07-09	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	FERC has the ability to reserve the right to revisit cumulative impacts and conduct studies after the license has been issued if there is a concern that an important cumulative effect has been overlooked.	An approach has been developed for the evaluation of cumulative impacts. Please consult section 5.1 of the Final SD1.
W-07-10	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Relicensing of the Oroville Facilities would not result in the creation of new water supplies, therefore an extensive analysis of urban and agricultural growth-inducing impacts is not warranted. This scope should be limited.	The DWR agrees with the assumption that relicensing will not result in an increase of water supply for the SWP beyond what is currently available. This assertion can be tested by analyzing operational model results.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-07-11	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	SWC agrees with discussion in Section 2.4, p. 15 of the Draft SD1 but believes it should identify and expand on important reasons why Oroville relicensing and the CALFED Program should be coordinated.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-07-12	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	The CALFED Program constitutes a comprehensive plan and should be included in the comprehensive plan analysis.	Study Plan SP-L3 will consider the CALFED Program for consistency with comprehensive planning.
W-07-13	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	The analysis of cumulative effects in the Oroville PDEA must include the beneficial impacts of environmental restoration projects developed through the CALFED Program.	An approach has been developed for the evaluation of cumulative impacts. Please consult Section 5.1 of the Final SD1.
W-07-14	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	CALFED studies of cumulative effects should be fully utilized and not duplicated. CALFED studies proposed and underway should be listed in Appendix D to the SD.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-07-15	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Participation with the CALFED process would allow for interactions with agencies or actors that are not engaged in the Oroville relicensing.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-07-16	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Coordination of the Oroville relicensing process with the CALFED Program would address in one process, a comprehensive solution rather than pursue particular objectives in collateral proceedings outside the CALFED process.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-07-17	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	The Final SD1 needs to explain how NEPA scoping for the Oroville relicensing will be coordinated with the CALFED Program.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-07-18	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	SWC recommends that a work group be established to institutionalize the coordination and liaison function with the CALFED Program.	Oroville Facilities relicensing activities will be internally coordinated by DWR staff. An additional Work Group is not required.
W-07-19	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	The SD should provide an expanded explanation of how coordination with other comprehensive proceedings will occur. DWR should include an extensive list of studies with direct ties to the Oroville Project that are currently underway with other agencies.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
W-07-20	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	DWR and its consultants should focus on the importance of grouping studies by function and assigning critical path status to the studies that must move forward to timely collect vital field info in early 2002.	Critical path Study Plans are identified in Appendix D. These were identified based on Study Plan function.
W-07-21	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	SWC requests that Appendix D (Plenary review of Draft SD1) is changed to convey the same info contained in Section 3.1.2, p. 20, "The licensee is currently conducting studies that focus on water quality and aquatic resources... These studies are summarized in Appendix D."	Appendix D of the Draft SD1 has been re-titled Appendix C. The title of this appendix conveys that these studies are not a part of the ALP, but may provide data for consideration by the ALP.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-07-22	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	Flood control alternative (4th bullet) in Section 3.1.2 should be deleted because it does not provide a good example of a preferred alternative in the Oroville relicensing process.	To comply with CEQA and NEPA, DWR is currently developing alternatives to the proposed action/proposed project. SD2 will include a description of alternatives that will be considered in the PDEA.
W-07-23	State Water Contractors November 26, 2001	With respect to the 1st paragraph of Appendix C, it would be more appropriate to use the comments to refine the study plans rather than to refine the issue statements.	Appendix B and C of the Draft SD1 have been combined in Appendix B of the Final SD1. Appendix B “the issue tracker” tracks the disposition of comments, concerns, and issues in the ALP process.
W-08-01	Feather River Diverters (Joint Water Districts and Western Canal Water District September, 29, 2001 - Attachment	Concerns with low water temperature from the Thermalito Afterbay resulting in crop damage. Requests a license provision regarding suitable water temperature during certain periods.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. Water temperatures for agricultural purposes will be evaluated in the PDEA.
W-08-02	Feather River Diverters (Joint Water Districts and Western Canal Water District September, 29, 2001 - Attachment	Concerns with low water temperature from the Thermalito Afterbay resulting in crop damage. Requests a license provision regarding water temperature during certain periods.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
W-08-03	Feather River Diverters (Joint Water Districts and Western Canal Water District September, 29, 2001 - Attachment	NMFS recommendations for meeting water temperatures for fisheries in the Feather River would result in adverse temperature conditions for agricultural irrigation water and conflict with the 1969 water rights settlement.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
W-08-04	Feather River Diverters (Joint Water Districts and Western Canal Water District September, 29, 2001 – Attachment (Mattson)	Information on crop production with water obtained from the Oroville Facilities.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Response
W-08-05	Feather River Diverters (Joint Water Districts and Western Canal Water District) September, 29, 2001 – Attachment (Adams)	Information on crop production with water obtained from the Oroville Facilities.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
W-08-06	Feather River Diverters (Joint Water Districts and Western Canal Water District) September, 29, 2001 – Attachment (LaMalfa)	Information on crop production with water obtained from the Oroville Facilities.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
W-08-07	Feather River Diverters (Joint Water Districts and Western Canal Water District) September, 29, 2001 – Attachment (Sligar)	Information on crop production with water obtained from the Oroville Facilities.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
W-08-08	Feather River Diverters (Joint Water Districts and Western Canal Water District) September, 29, 2001 – Attachment (Job)	Information on crop production with water obtained from the Oroville Facilities.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue.
W-08-09	Feather River Diverters (Joint Water Districts and Western Canal Water District) September, 29, 2001 – Attachment	Historical account of cold water issues at the Oroville Facilities.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.

APPENDIX E, ATTACHMENT 1

Summary of Comments from the Public Meetings and DWR Responses

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M1-01-01	Robert Fehlman – Western Canal Water District Doak Cotter - Joint Water Districts	Would like to see the ALP address concerns for irrigation water temperatures	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
M1-01-02	Robert Fehlman – Western Canal Water District Doak Cotter - Joint Water Districts	Water temperature affect on plants: Below 50° F– Plants Die; 50-55° F– Low germination activity; 55-60° F– Low Yield and seedling production	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
M1-01-03	Robert Fehlman and Doak Cotter Joint Water Districts	Not recommended to plant rice when combined water and soil temperature is below 65° F.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
M1-01-04	Robert Fehlman – Western Canal Water District Doak Cotter - Joint Water Districts	Recommend that DWR review brochure produced by the Department of Water Resources for State of California at the time of the building of Oroville Dam and Reservoir.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
M1-01-05	Robert Fehlman – Western Canal Water District Doak Cotter - Joint Water Districts	The University of California has demonstrated that rice plants thrive best when the temperature of irrigating waters range from 59 - 77° F. Even in this range, temperature fluctuation vastly affects the harvest.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M1-01-06	Robert Fehlman – Western Canal Water District Doak Cotter - Joint Water Districts	With the proper outlet structure of Oroville Dam, the temperature of releases can be controlled to serve the agriculture interests of the area.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
M1-01-07	Robert Fehlman – Western Canal Water District Doak Cotter - Joint Water Districts	Requests a review of eight examples of reduced rice production yields developed during the 1999 irrigation season due to colder water temperatures. Examples are set forth in Exhibit A-5	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
M1-02-01	Floyd Higgins Oroville Radio Control Model Airplane Club	The Airplane club would like to see improvements at their flying field on Oroville Road.	The proposed improvements at the flying field may be implemented under the Interim Project Program. Please see Section 3.2 of Appendix E.
M1-03-01	Ron Turner Oroville Foundation of Flight	Would like a year round base to accommodate seaplanes on the Afterbay waterway.	The proposed seaplane base is being considered as a potential interim project. Additional information is needed to assess the project feasibility. The Recreation Work Group will continue to consider this issue during study plan implementation. This may conflict with the DFG wildlife management objectives for the Afterbay.
M1-04-01	Rob MacKenzie Butte County	Issue statement LM1 – Interested in keeping public access open for all the recreation facilities at all times.	Public access to recreation facilities will be considered in Study Plans SP-R1 “Public and Private Vehicular Access” and SP-R6 “ADA Accessibility Assessment.” Security concerns will be considered in SP-R2. SP-L2 will address access to project lands.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M1-04-02	Rob MacKenzie Butte County	Issue LM3 & LM4 – Facilitate law enforcement needs while keeping all areas open. Don't close an area just because of a problem.	Public access to recreation facilities will be considered in Study Plans SP-R2 "Recreation Safety Assessment" and SP-L2 "Land Management Study."
M1-04-03	Rob MacKenzie Butte County	Are the Draft SD1 comments going to be routed to the work groups and incorporated into the study plans?	Comments on the Draft SD1 have been distributed to the study plan authors for consideration. This allowed for changes in the study plans that have been reviewed by the Work Groups.
M1-04-04	Rob MacKenzie Butte County	Are the work groups going to have approval authority for the consultants that are hired to do the study plans?	DWR and the Harza-EDAW Team will implement the Study Plans.
M1-05-01	Mike Kelley Butte County Tax Payers Association	Interested in obtaining energy from DWR (at cost) that could be used for manufacturing and be limited to the Oroville sphere of influence	DWR has investigated this issue in conjunction with Butte County Tax Payers Association, and determined that it is not practical due to feasibility, cost, and regulatory constraints.
M1-06-01	Peter Maki Citizen of Oroville	Stakeholders are being discounted, and DWR is choosing which (recreation) projects it will fund.	The Recreation Work Group has developed a series of studies to describe the existing recreational resources associated with the Project and evaluate current and future demand for recreation. These studies will allow the DWR and stakeholders to recommend additional facilities for consideration during settlement discussions within the ALP.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M1-06-02	Peter Maki Citizen of Oroville	DWR Employees and representatives have been hostile to local groups and individuals who have championed projects that will potentially cost DWR money.	<p>DWR employees and representatives have worked collaboratively with local groups including the Feather River Recreation and Parks District, JPA, Oroville Redevelopment Agency, and City of Oroville to negotiate an agreement to fund 2.2 million Riverbend Park Improvements.</p> <p>Additionally, working with local stakeholders and agencies, DWR and the Oroville Collaborative generated a list of consensus-backed interim recreation projects that are currently underway, ahead of relicense application.</p> <p>The Oroville Relicensing collaborative continues to work with local stakeholders to address issues of concern and expects to begin development of PM&E measures.</p>
M1-06-03	Peter Maki Citizen of Oroville	DWR has been a poor land user. Dangerous fuel loads exist on state lands controlled by DWR.	This issue is addressed in Study Plans SP-L5 and SP-T11.
M1-06-04	Peter Maki Citizen of Oroville	DWR controls excess land that could be better served to the taxpayers through recreational usage.	Recreational use of the Project lands will be considered in a series of recreational studies developed by the Recreation Work Group. Study Plan SP-R17 will include recommendations for enhancements to the exiting facilities or additional new facilities for recreation.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M1-06-05	Peter Maki Citizen of Oroville	DWR contractors have deliberately made the relicensing process burdensome and time-consuming in attempts to discourage local involvement.	DWR adopted the ALP process to allow for greater public participation in the relicensing process. DWR has provided extensive outreach efforts, including public meetings, website postings, and distribution of documents such as this scoping document. Stakeholders have several options for providing comments on the process including public meetings, toll free phone line, e-mails, and written statements. These efforts have been developed to encourage public participation.
M1-06-06	Peter Maki Citizen of Oroville	DWR and FERC discount bulletin 107-6 (Bulletin 117-6) and are in denial to the recreational build-up promised to the Oroville community in the 1960's.	DWR is in compliance with their existing recreation plan. The collaborative licensing process is studying recreational needs, and will evaluate PM&E measure to address the need.
M1-06-07	Peter Maki Citizen of Oroville	DWR and water contractors would like to obtain the license at the least possible cost.	As a State agency, DWR is responsible to the citizens of California for the cost of relicensing. DWR is seeking to balance the costs of relicensing with the value of the benefits to the citizens of the State.
M1-07-01	Ron Davis California State Horseman's Association	DWR has been cordial in working with the public.	Comment noted.
M1-07-02	Ron Davis California State Horseman's Association	Concerned that promises were made of a greater recreation development then has been seen.	DWR is in compliance with their existing recreation plan. The collaborative licensing process is studying recreational needs, and will evaluate PM&E measure to address the need.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M1-07-03	Ron Davis California State Horseman's Association	Old recreation plans called for equestrian centers, which haven't been built.	The collaborative licensing process is studying recreational needs, and will evaluate PM&E measure to address the need.
M1-07-04	Ron Davis California State Horseman's Association	Would like to see existing equestrian facilities expanded.	The collaborative licensing process is studying recreational needs, and will evaluate PM&E measure to address the need.
M1-07-05	Ron Davis California State Horseman's Association	Interested in facilities that horses owners and non-horse owners can use simultaneously.	The collaborative licensing process is studying recreational needs, and will evaluate PM&E measure to address the need.
M1-07-06	Ron Davis California State Horseman's Association	State Parks has not provided notifications on trail work and closure.	Comment noted.
M1-07-07	Ron Davis California State Horseman's Association	State Parks has not provided notification on the construction of new trails.	Comment noted.
M1-07-08	Ron Davis California State Horseman's Association	Requests that State Parks comply with the recreation plan created during the relicensing process and involved the public.	Comment noted.
M1-07-09	Ron Davis California State Horseman's Association	There is difficulty in getting local people involved in the process	DWR is implementing the ALP because it allows for greater public involvement in the relicensing process. DWR has addressed specific concerns for public involvement through the process and will continue to work with stakeholders in the relicensing of the Oroville Facilities.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M1-08-01	Kathy Hodges Equestrian Trail Riders and Hikers	State Parks isn't interested in general public input. They are only interested in hearing from people who agree with them. That attitude should change	Opinion noted.
M1-08-02	Kathy Hodges Equestrian Trail Riders and Hikers	A desire is emerging with the local people to take recreation control away from State Parks and give it to local entities.	This issue is addressed in Study Plan SP-R5, Assess Recreation Area Management.
M2-01-01	Mike Wade California Farm Water Coalition	Obviously a reliable and sufficient water supply is critically important in order for California growers to compete.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-01-02	Mike Wade California Farm Water Coalition	Any reduction in water supplies available to the customers of the SWP due to regulatory action under this relicensing process would have severe impacts and should be avoided.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-01-03	Mike Wade California Farm Water Coalition	Just as important as the sufficient quantities of water is the price of water. The SWP is user-financed.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M2-01-04	Mike Wade California Farm Water Coalition	Water temperature and crop production in certain parts of the state are closely tied. According to the University of California Cooperative Extension, certain crops, such as rice, need water temperatures of at least 65 degrees during the four-week planting period in late spring and at least 59 degrees until the irrigation season is completed at the end of October.	Study Plan SP-E2 will provide engineering and operations information to address this issue. The issue will be addressed in the PDEA.
M2-01-05	Mike Wade California Farm Water Coalition	We cannot continue to prosper if we price our water supply out of reach of farmers. We cannot meet the challenges of the future if we are constantly reducing the water and power supplies already developed and available for our use.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-02-01	John Coburn State Water Contractors	Retaining or enhancing the current water supply and power generation from the Oroville facilities is essential for maintaining a reliable and affordable water supply for the 23 million Californians and 750,000 acres of farmland served by the SWP.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-02-02	John Coburn State Water Contractors	Operational changes that may be proposed during this relicensing process could negatively impact future water costs. Operational changes that result in reducing power generation capability and flexibility will result in increased costs to the State Water Contractors and ultimately much of the state's population.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M2-02-03	John Coburn State Water Contractors	Any loss of generation at Oroville requires the SWP to purchase replacement energy. This not only increases the cost of water, it imposes an additional demand on an already scarce electrical energy supply within California. However, the State Water Contractors' greatest concern is the possibility that operational changes will erode the water supply available to the SWP.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-02-04	John Coburn State Water Contractors	The Oroville Relicensing Process must move forward without duplicating ongoing efforts on an environmental and flood management issues if we are to ensure sound management of the state's limited water resources.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
M2-02-05	John Coburn State Water Contractors	This relicensing process must proceed in full recognition of the overall CALFED Program, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act and other ecosystem restoration initiatives.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
M2-02-06	John Coburn State Water Contractors	The environment and flood management studies undertaken in the relicensing process need to be tightly focused within the project boundaries.	The scope of study plans has been addressed for each study in the Work Group and Plenary study plan review process. Please see the discussion of study plans in Section 1.5 of the Final SD1.
M2-02-07	John Coburn State Water Contractors	Any options considered must be complimentary to ongoing efforts such as the CALFED Program and the Sacramento/San Joaquin Basins Comprehensive Study.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M2-02-08	John Coburn State Water Contractors	Any options considered must not result in any additional losses of SWP water supplies.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-02-09	John Coburn State Water Contractors	Maintaining or increasing the flexibility in releases is required to continue the beneficial use of the Oroville facilities for providing regulation, spinning reserves, non-spinning reserves, replacement reserves and voltage control required for a reliable operation of the SWP and the California power grid.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-02-10	John Coburn State Water Contractors	The State Water Contractors recognize that the relicensing process involves the balancing of water and power supply benefits with environmental, recreation and flood management needs.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible. The ALP provides a forum for review of the issues and concerns throughout the relicensing process. This is the forum to discuss a balance of resource benefits.
M2-02-11	John Coburn State Water Contractors	The State Water Contractors urge the Department of Water Resources and the other relicensing participants to seek innovative and creative solutions to meet those needs, solutions that do not needlessly sacrifice precious power and water resources.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible. The ALP provides a forum for review of the issues and concerns throughout the relicensing process. This is the forum to discuss a balance of resource benefits.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M2-03-01	Mary Lou Cotton Castaic Lake Water Agency	Any operational changes that result in reducing the power generation capability and flexibility will result in increased costs to the agency and to all the SWP contractors.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-03-02	Mary Lou Cotton Castaic Lake Water Agency	Of greater concern to our agency and the other contractors is the possibility that operational changes will erode the water supply available to the project. It's hard to imagine any credible operational changes that would justify reducing the water supply yield from the Oroville facilities.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-03-03	Mary Lou Cotton Castaic Lake Water Agency	Concerned about the potential for duplication of efforts between the Oroville Relicensing Process, the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act and other programs.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
M2-03-04	Mary Lou Cotton Castaic Lake Water Agency	The environmental studies undertaken in the relicensing process need to be tightly focused within the project boundary.	The scope of study plans has been addressed for each study in the Work Group and Plenary study plan review process. Please see the discussion of study plans in Section 1.5 of the Final SD1.
M2-03-05	Mary Lou Cotton Castaic Lake Water Agency	Any options considered must be complimentary to the CALFED Program and not result in losses to SWP water supplies.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E. Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M2-03-06	Mary Lou Cotton Castaic Lake Water Agency	The agency recognizes that the FERC relicensing process involves the balancing of power and water supply benefits with environmental, recreational and flood management needs. We urge that this process seek solutions to meet these needs, but they should be solutions that do not sacrifice water and power resources.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible. The ALP provides a forum for review of the issues and concerns throughout the relicensing process. This is the forum to discuss a balance of resource benefits.
M2-04-01	Dan Smith Association of California Water Agencies	We want to urge that the participants in this proceeding be aware that the actions they take, the decisions they make will have significant impact on most of California and most Californians.	Comment noted.
M2-04-02	Dan Smith Association of California Water Agencies	In our view, a successful relicensing proceeding will be one that retains the important power and water benefits of the Oroville facilities.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-05-01	Nan Nalder (for Domonic DiMare) CA Chamber of Commerce	Very concerned that the entire output of the Oroville Facilities is retained to keep the grid stable and to provide the energy that we so very much need to keep California in a stable sense.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-05-02	Nan Nalder (for Domonic DiMare) CA Chamber of Commerce	Like electricity, California faces difficult challenges concerning water supply and price.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M2-06-01	Ed Ely (for Rex Hime) CA Business Properties Association	It is so important that we maintain the water supply that we currently have because we can't afford to lose any more ground.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-06-02	Ed Ely (for Rex Hime) CA Business Properties Association	Concerned about any regulatory proceeding that would further reduce our current water supplies.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-06-03	Ed Ely (for Rex Hime) CA Business Properties Association	The CALFED solution area encompasses the Feather River Watershed, and any additional environmental actions contemplated by this relicensing must not be duplicative of those efforts.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
M2-06-04	Ed Ely (for Rex Hime) CA Business Properties Association	The relicensing process must fully weigh its actions in light of their potential negative impacts.	The ALP allows for Plenary Group and Work Group review of the issues and concerns throughout the relicensing process including the potential for negative project-related impacts.
M2-06-05	Ed Ely (for Rex Hime) CA Business Properties Association	California cannot afford to lose any more water due to regulatory fiat.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M2-07-01	Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel Southern CA Water Committee	We cannot afford to further reduce the amount of supplement water necessary to support Southern California's economy and population.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-07-02	Geoffrey Vanden Heuvel Southern CA Water Committee	Our goal for the relicensing of the Oroville hydropower facilities is to maintain the level of benefits we currently receive from water stored at the reservoir and to continue to use project-generated power to help offset the cost of that water.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-08-01	Vincent Wong Alameda Co. Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Zone 7	I'm here to stress the importance of retaining and enhancing the water supply and power generation of the Oroville facilities. It's essential for maintaining the economy of my community as well as California as a whole.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-08-02	Vincent Wong Alameda Co. Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Zone 7	Any operational changes that reduce power generation will increase the cost to my constituency.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-08-03	Vincent Wong Alameda Co. Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Zone 7	Any operational changes that will erode the water supply are very stressful to us.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M2-08-04	Vincent Wong Alameda Co. Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Zone 7	It is important for the relicensing process to recognize the CALFED, the Central Valley Improvement Act and other ecosystem restoration initiatives.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.
M2-09-01	Wilson Head CA Independent System Operator	The ISO controlled grid has ties to the hydroelectric pump-generators at Hyatt – Thermalito. Difficulties presently exist with the ISO controlled grid. The Oroville Facilities help the ISO manage these problems.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-09-02	Wilson Head CA Independent System Operator	The ISO looks forward to undiminished generating capacity during the FERC relicensing process both for the energy it supplies to California and the additional reliability it provides to the ISO grid.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-09-03	Wilson Head CA Independent System Operator	Upon relicensing, the pump generator complex would be counted upon to continue to help mitigate these electric system operational issues and remain standing as a basic infrastructure element for reliable Northern California electric system.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-10-01	Don Marquez for Thomas Clark Kern County Water Agency	Concerned that the operational changes that result in reducing power generation capability and flexibility result in increased water costs to the Agency and ultimately to our landowners and other ratepayers.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M2-10-02	Don Marquez for Thomas Clark Kern County Water Agency	Of equal or greater concern to the Agency and the other contractors is the possibility that operational changes will erode our water supply.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-10-03	Don Marquez for Thomas Clark Kern County Water Agency	It is inconceivable that any potential operational change would justify further reducing the water supply yield from the Oroville facilities.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-11-01	Lisa Wolfe State Electricity Oversight Board	Overall, the EOB underscores the important and significant electric contribution of the Oroville Facilities, including the provision of needed ancillary services that maintain grid reliability.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-12-01	Ken Kules Metropolitan Water District	The Project operates to provide peak power to the state of California, and the SWP as a user emphasizes its use of power off peak. And we believe that to be very important.	Throughout the relicensing process, DWR will focus on retaining the water supply / power supply values and benefits of the Oroville Facilities to the extent possible.
M2-12-02	Ken Kules Metropolitan Water District	We strongly believe that it would be highly inappropriate for the process to second-guess the measures and level of protection for the environment developed through the CALFED process.	Please see DWR approach for coordination with comprehensive planning efforts in Section 3.3 of Appendix E.

Comment Number	Source	Summary of Comment	Final Response
M2-12-03	Ken Kules Metropolitan Water District	While the reliability of existing SWP supplies is critical for the regional economy, additional supplies from Oroville are not part of our plans to meet Southern California's future water supply needs. We respectfully request that this fundamental fact be recognized as this process moves forward.	Comment noted.